Decisions from DW Tech & Mgt Review Meeting
April 3, 2002

NPIRS

1. Continue to take the standard PCC export, migrate to Patch 6 when that is implemented.
2. NPIRS does not have to load new Patch 6 ORYX and GPRA fields into tables.
3. NPIRS can just store modified and deleted records that will be newly sent in Patch 6, thereby not having to make the DB structure, programming, and processing changes that would be required.
4. Standard export will continue to go thought BXP at Area. When patch 6 is implemented, BXP modifications will also be implemented to handle these changes.
5. No change in exports to NPIRS or modifications in NPIRS DB structure, programming, processing after patch 6.

Data Warehouse

Prior to implementing DW-1, there will need to be a fully developed implementation plan and adequately trained and resourced staff in place.

1. We are proceeding towards nationwide implementation (DW-1) of essentially the current PDW structure with enhancements to occur subsequent to successful, nationwide implementation, rather than first to extensive enhancements and additional testing.
2. DW-1 will be implemented with two initial data marts: a statistical data mart that performs at least the current reporting functions of NPIRS and a clinical data mart that at least performs the current functions of the ORYX database.
3. The RPMS registration and encounter exports from local sites will be in HL7 format and will be sent directly to the IE. These two, currently separate exports will be combined so that the program will first send new, modified, or deleted registration records and then do the same for encounter records. This export will be separate from and occur in parallel to the current exports to NPIRS, until transition to the DW is complete and the DW is the production system.
4. Our eventual goal will be that the IE will accept encounter and registration exports from non-RPMS sites only in HL7 format. It is anticipated that the DW will not continue to develop and maintain custom interfaces with non-RPMS sites (as NPIRS is currently doing).
5. The IE will reformat the HL7 messages it receives from both RPMS and non-RPMS sites into a format compatible with the ETL processes currently being used by PDW (or with minimal modifications in the ETL) as specified by the DW project team, and export encounter data directly to the DW.
6. The trigger for the HL7 local PCC export will be exactly the same as the trigger for the current PCC Statistical Record Export (i.e., a local menu driven export that sends all new, modified, or deleted messages at the chosen time of the export).
7. The IE Test Plan developed conjointly by the Data Transport Workgroup and NPIRS will be expanded to cover RPMS encounter as well as registration data and utilized in this DW-1 implementation to test the new HL7 export method.
8. DW-1 will receive the other source files PDW accepted (CHS638, CHS FI, Denrun[?]) in the format PDW received them and will use PDW developed ETL processes to load them.
9. PDW SAS reports, explorations, Web enablement, and evaluations will be completed, as specified in that contract.
10. The PDW DB will be partitioned and several load enhancements implemented. Then load rates will be re-tested.
11. Enhancement and refinement of the logical and physical models will be performed at three levels
    a. Add additional patch 6 content
    b. Perform enhancements based on lessons learned by DW project team
    c. Make modifications based on an independent review by selected NPIRS staff, George Huggins, Jim McCain, Mike Danielson, Rich Hall, Clayton Curtis, other to-be-identified VHA colleagues.

    This independent review will begin with the understanding that we first and foremost designed the model to accommodate current information exports and then to also accommodate growth into a more completely normalized design that would eventually be able to handle a more complete set of data. We are asking the reviewers to focus on the following three questions:

a. Are there any critical errors in the model that will prevent or severely limit our current anticipated functionality?
b. Are there any design features that would preclude anticipated future growth and development?
c. Are there design modifications that would improve efficiency, power, scalability, etc. without losing significant informational content?

The focus of this review will not be to specify future growth needs, e.g., in the future which tables/fields will need to be added, which tables will need to be re-designed as new terminologies become available, which fields need to be eventually moved from a flat to a more normalized structure (although we need to know that we can do this), etc. Furthermore, a major re-design of the model is not to be considered unless serious design flaws are identified in this review based on the above-specified first three questions.

12. The IBM contract for Steve Carey's services will be funded through June 30, 2002, with an additional 20 hours per month for three months (July, August, September 2002), in order to complete critical work on the PDW and complete the transfer of essential knowledge and skills to ITSC staff so that ITSC can continue the project internally. The additional hours in July – September 2002 are for anticipated follow-up questions and consultation.
13. ETL documentation will be completed.
14. Metadata repository within IBM's Data Warehouse Manager will be initially populated and ITSC staff trained to continue to enhance Metadata documentation in an ongoing fashion.
15. An interim project team will be created within 2 weeks to oversee the above transitional work. This team will also be responsible for putting together a draft proposal, for DIR management review, for the staffing and implementation of DW-1
16. It is anticipated that all major PDW work will be complete within 6 months (October 31, 2002).